UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/948
S/1995/602
21 July 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Agenda item 51
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fiftieth year

Letter dated 21 July 1995 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to draw your attention and that of the members of the General Assembly and the Security Council to some very serious developments in Cyprus resulting from and indicative of the aggressive aims of the Turkish occupation forces in Cyprus.

Only recently, you brought to the attention of the Security Council (see S/1995/561) the extensive constructions the Turkish side had undertaken on the Rokkas Bastion in contravention of the 1989 unmanning agreement between the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), the Cyprus National Guard and the Turkish forces in Cyprus.

While the problem created by the Rokkas Bastion construction has not yet been satisfactorily resolved, with the Security Council still awaiting to be informed by you of the relevant developments, new information has surfaced indicating that the Turkish forces in Cyprus have secretly constructed extensive military fortifications all along the buffer zone.

The strengthening of the offensive capabilities of the Turkish occupation forces in Cyprus is a matter of grave concern. As you noted in your report on UNFICYP (S/1995/488) the northern part of the island, with its garrison of some 30,000 Turkish troops and some 4,500 Turkish Cypriot troops, remains one of the most highly militarized areas in the world in terms of the ratio between the numbers of military personnel and civilians. In addition to the grave concerns raised as a result of the numerical strength of the Turkish occupation troops, equal, if not graver, concerns are raised with respect to the upgrading of their armaments. In the same report, you stated that during the reporting period, the Turkish forces had completed their programme to upgrade their fleet of between 250 and 300 tanks to the M48 A5 standard and had introduced new artillery

systems, including twin barrelled, towed anti-aircraft guns and a battalion of 155 mm self-propelled howitzers. You stated that these changes substantially enhanced the military capabilities of the Turkish forces in Cyprus.

The strengthening of the offensive capabilities of the Turkish occupation forces in Cyprus, coupled with the completion of extensive fortifications all along the buffer zone, are indicative of the real intentions of Turkey in Cyprus: that is, the imposition of a military solution, something to which Turkey resorts with utter contempt to international law and civilized behaviour. The Turkish military invasion of 20 July 1974, the twenty-first anniversary of which was celebrated in the occupied areas only yesterday with military parades during which Turkish air-force F-16 aircraft and helicopters violated the airspace of Cyprus in a show of arrogance and military might, is a constant reminder to the international community of Turkey's way of dealing with weaker neighbours.

Referring to the Turkish celebrations on the twenty-first anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, the Turkish daily Hurriyet, in a front-page article entitled "Invasion celebrations" on 20 July 1995, reveals the existence of military plans which can be implemented at any time against Cyprus. In these plans, according to Hurriyet, areas of Turkish attack have been defined on maps as well as in other information. Hurriyet's article confirms the fact that, as far as Turkey is concerned, the military operation in Cyprus was not over with the occupation of almost 40 per cent of Cyprus in 1974. It is an ongoing process with well defined objectives, which, unless firmly rebuffed by the international community, Turkey will implement as it implemented the 1974 invasion on the island.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus strongly denounces the latest aggressive acts of Turkey, which constitute a direct threat to the peace and security in the island and in the eastern Mediterranean in general, a flagrant violation of the spirit of the 1989 unmanning agreement and of the recently adopted Security Council resolution 1000 (1995) of 23 June 1995.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus considers it imperative that all these Turkish military fortifications along the buffer zone, which may be used by the occupation army for launching an attack, be demolished immediately, under UNFICYP supervision.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus hopes that you will take all measures necessary for resolving this extremely serious problem, which constitutes a new source of tension and threatens the security of the island and of the region.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, under item 51, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Alexandros N. VIKIS
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/949
S/1995/630
28 July 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Agenda item 51
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fiftieth year

Letter dated 27 July 1995 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i.
of the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 27 July 1995, addressed to you by H.E. Mr. Osman Ertuğ, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 51, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hayati GÜVEN
Deputy Permanent Representative
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

95-22645 (E) 010895 020895

/...

Annex

Letter dated 27 July 1995 from
H.E. Mr. Osman Ertuğ

I have the honour to refer to a recent letter, dated 21 July 1995, addressed to you by the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Greek Cypriot administration, which was circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (A/49/948-S/1995/602). The letter in question is a characteristic example of the Greek Cypriot side's continuing attempts to create artificial issues and tensions with a view to diverting attention from its own militarization campaign, which is in high gear with a military spending of about $2 million per day. In doing so, the Greek Cypriot propagandists deal a further blow to prospects for confidence-building between the two communities in Cyprus and a comprehensive solution.

I believe that the answer to the Greek Cypriot side's allegations regarding the children's playground on the Yigitler (Roccas) Bastion in the Turkish Cypriot sector of Nicosia can be found in your letter to the President of the Security Council dated 25 July 1995, in which it is stated that "UNFICYP is of the view that construction on Roccas Bastion to date, including the material used, does not indicate work carried out to normal military specifications, or to any evident military logic". You further indicate that UNFICYP has had access, and will continue to have "unhindered periodic access to the site" during and after the completion of the work.

This confirms the position stated by the Turkish Cypriot side from the beginning that the civilian construction in this locality has no military use or purpose. Therefore, I need not dwell on this matter any further, except to say that, at a time when the international community is grappling with the human tragedy in Bosnia and a host of other serious problems crowding its agenda and when, in Cyprus itself, attention should be focused on building confidence as a first step towards making progress on a comprehensive solution, it is regrettable that the Greek Cypriot side should generate so much ill-intentioned propaganda and waste the time and resources of the United Nations on such a nonsensical issue.

If there is a party in Cyprus increasing its military capability through the so-called "joint military doctrine" (with Greece) and is constructing fortifications or strengthening them along the borders, it is the Greek Cypriot side itself. As stated in paragraph 13 of your most recent report to the Security Council dated 15 June 1995 (S/1995/488), "... the National Guard continued with an extensive programme to strengthen its military positions, or to add new ones, along and behind its cease-fire line opposite all sectors of the buffer zone".

As recently as this week, Mr. Clerides, the Greek Cypriot leader, has announced that his "Government has decided to carry out military fortification works along the confrontation line", confirming that the work already under way will continue (see the Greek Cypriot daily Eleftherotipia of 24 July 1995).

The militarization campaign in south Cyprus does not stop at building or strengthening fortifications. Paragraph 18 (b) of your above-mentioned report, in which you state that the Greek Cypriot National Guard "has continued its comprehensive programme to upgrade its strength", gives substantial information regarding the manpower and firepower aspects of this campaign. The acquisition of Exocet missiles and plans to purchase a significant number of tanks, armoured personnel carriers and an air-defence system and the recruiting of personnel, including from Greece, with a stated target over five years of an additional 5,000 men, in the context of the joint "Defence Dogma" are among the findings of the report.

The above are in addition to the active strength of 15,000 of the "National Guard" and, additionally, thousands of officers and men from mainland Greece. With the number of paramilitary forces and reservists, the combined strength of the Greek and Greek Cypriot military forces in the south reaches a total of 104,270 according to the latest figures published by the Institute of Strategic Studies. These facts and figures show the fallacy of "the weaker neighbour" argument of the Greek Cypriot Chargé in his aforementioned letter. In view of what the Greek Cypriots are capable of doing, and have done in the past, to their weaker Turkish Cypriot neighbours, such an argument appears the epitome of hypocrisy. In so far as the comparison is with Turkey, I wish to point out that this is simply a wrong comparison.

I would, furthermore, like to remind a deliberately forgetful Greek Cypriot side that, in its apparent attempt to turn this issue into a numbers game, exaggerating the troop strength in the north does not change the fact that it is Turkey's presence as an effective deterrent that has kept the peace in Cyprus in the last 21 years. It is clear from their militarization activities and statements that the Greek Cypriots are trying to upset the existing balance as a prelude to new adventures. Bolstered by their newly acquired military hardware, even the leader of the Greek Cypriot community, Mr. Clerides, has been engaged in some warmongering of his own, by publicly declaring that waging war is an option available to the Greek Cypriot side, thus joining the chorus of Greek Cypriot political, religious and other community leaders who are openly propagating the concept of military action against their Turkish Cypriot neighbours (Greek Cypriot press reports dated 18 July 1995).

As for the exploitation of certain press reports in a Turkish daily, this shows how desperate the Greek Cypriot side is in finding fuel for its propaganda machine. Adding insult to injury, the Greek Cypriot side did not even show the honesty or courtesy of quoting Hürriyet newspaper accurately. It should be pointed out that the correct terminology used by this Turkish mainland daily in describing the Turkish intervention of 20 July 1974 has never been any other than "the Turkish Peace Operation".

In view of the damaging international press coverage that the Greek Cypriot side has had in recent months, it should be no wonder that it is desperately trying to divert the attention of world public opinion from this and from its own militarization activities by resorting to unfounded allegations. It will be recalled that southern Cyprus has recently been the subject of various articles in the international press as a country which, while paying lip service to international law, not only violates sanctions against the Serbs and others, but

also serves as a centre for arms-smuggling, drug-trafficking, money-laundering and other criminal activity. Reputable newspapers such as L'Express of Belgium of 6 April 1995, The Washington Times of 20 May and 20 June 1995, and The New York Times of 15 June 1995 extensively reported on such activity, even linking it directly to some Greek Cypriot officials. In The New York Times article of 15 June 1995, for instance, under the heading "Cyprus Shores Wash Dirty Money", it is reported that "... senior Cypriot politicians and executives have even used their business as fronts for Serbian companies seeking to break the sanctions on Yugoslavia".

In the face of this overwhelming evidence of rampant illegality in southern Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot administration would do well to concentrate its efforts on cleaning its own house. Blaming others, particularly on issues that have no basis in fact, only further poisons the atmosphere between the two communities, making efforts towards a solution all the more difficult.

In this connection, I would also like to emphasize that Mr. Clerides's rejection of the recent call by President Rauf Denktaş for a face-to-face meeting between the two leaders is most regrettable and demonstrates the continued lack of political will on the part of the Greek Cypriot side for a negotiated solution. It is ironic that Mr. Clerides has described such a meeting as "a waste of time", at a moment when his own administration is wasting not only its own time but also that of the international community by its incessant and obsessive slander campaign against Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I would be grateful if this letter is circulated as a document of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 51, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/950
S/1995/635
1 August 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Agenda item 39
THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND
HERZEGOVINA

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fiftieth year

Letter dated 31 July 1995 from the Permanent Representative of Brunei Darussalam to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of a statement issued by the Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 28 July 1995

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 39, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Pengiran ABDUL MOMIN
Permanent Representative
to the United Nations

95-22823 (E) 010895 020895

/...

Annex

Statement dated 28 July 1995 by the Foreign Ministers of the Association of South-East Asian Nations on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

1. The Foreign Ministers of ASEAN discussed the extremely grave situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and condemned the seizure of the United Nations safe areas of Srebrenica and Zepa by the Bosnian Serb forces as well as their attacks on the safe areas of Bihac, Gorazde and Sarajevo. They demand the immediate withdrawal of the Bosnian Serb forces from Srebrenica and Zepa. They support all international efforts to put a stop to the continuing aggression, strangulation of the United Nations safe areas, ethnic cleansing and genocide in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Bosnian Serbs, which constitute flagrant violations of international humanitarian law and Security Council resolutions.

2. They express their profound anguish at the failure and paralysis of the United Nations mission in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in responding and addressing the fast-deteriorating situation in that country. They call upon the United Nations, in particular the Security Council to authorize the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to use all necessary measures to protect the United Nations safe areas in accordance with all relevant Security Council resolutions. They also call on the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to protect, defend and secure the lifelines to all United Nations safe areas, in particular Sarajevo.

3. They condemn the open and blatant attacks on UNPROFOR personnel by the Serbs. They support the continuing presence of UNPROFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They call upon UNPROFOR to respond appropriately in order to enable it to carry out its mandate in Bosnia and Herzegovina effectively.

4. The Foreign Ministers accept the right of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and the legitimate right of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to request and receive military assistance. They therefore support the lifting of the United Nations arms embargo imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina as called for in paragraph 22 of General Assembly resolution 49/10 adopted on 3 November 1994.

5. They also support the sovereign and national right of Croatia to regain the territories seized and now under the control of the Serbs.

6. They regret the failure of the Security Council to find a just and durable settlement and call upon the permanent members of the Council effectively to bring an end to the tragedy and achieve peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They pledge their readiness to support international efforts to realize this objective.